

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. The Office has indicated that claims 1-14 and 19 are directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 12, 13, and 20 have been amended to delete reference to “N-oxides.” Claim 15 has been amended to delete reference to “prevention.” Claims 16 and 17 have been amended to even further define the recited inventions. No new matter has been added. The Applicants assert that the present amendments raise no new issues and that they put the case in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendments is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 15-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly non-enabling for N-oxides or the “prevention” of the diseases listed in the claims. While the Applicants do not necessarily agree, the claims have been amended to delete reference to “N-oxides” and “prevention.” The Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the deleted subject matter in continuing or divisional applications. The rejection is thus considered moot.

Claims 16 and 17 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly non-enabling for every disease listed in the claims. The Applicants assert that the full breadth of the claims is enabled by the specification and that one skilled in the art would be able to practice the invention without undue experimentation. Nevertheless, in order to advance the case to allowance, the claims have been amended to refer specifically to “type 2” diabetes (see specification at page 35, lines 8 and 11-12; page 36, lines 8-9; page 37, lines 5-6). The term “inflammatory diseases” has been amended to refer only to “GSK3-mediated” inflammatory diseases. The term “cancer” has been deleted from the claims. The rejection is considered moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 15 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite as to the term “therapeutically effective amount.” The Applicants assert that the term is readily understood by one skilled in the art and its use does not render the claims

DOCKET NO.: JANS-0089 (PRD2065F-PCT-US)
Application No.: 10/565,065
Office Action Dated: January 7, 2008

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

indefinite. In addition, the Applicants direct the Office's attention to the specification at, for example, page 37, lines 30-37, where this is described. The Applicants also note that this term is present in numerous issued U.S. patents, including U.S. 7,326,708 (claims 17-20), U.S. 7,323,484 (claim 3), U.S. 7,300,936 (claims 23-24), and U.S. 7,294,631 (claim 8), all of which identify Examiner Wilson, who is also associated with the prosecution of this application, as the Primary Examiner. The Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

* * *

The foregoing represents a *bona fide* attempt to address all remaining issues raised in the January 7, 2008 Office Action. The claims are considered in condition for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance to that effect is, therefore, earnestly solicited.

Date: March 7, 2008

/Stephanie A. Barbosa/

Stephanie A. Barbosa
Registration No. 51,430

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439